

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Technical amendments are suggested for claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15, and 18. No claims have been cancelled or added.

Therefore, claims 1-5, 7-11, 14-18 and 21 are hereby presented for examination.

Closing of Prosecution on the Merits

Pursuant to the Office Action mailed on April 3, 2007, the Examiner has found that the application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters identified in the Office Action.

This response is intended to address only formal matters, and is not intended to address issues regarding prosecution on the merits.

Amendments to the Claims

The Applicant has suggested amendments to claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15, and 18. It is submitted that such amendments are merely minor corrections, add no new matter to the claims, and do not affect prosecution on the merits in this application.

Claims 1 and 8 are amended to eliminate an extraneous word “and”, which was erroneously left in line 11 of claim 1 and line 12 of claim 8.

Claims 4, 11, and 18 are amended to correct the use of the common acronym “IRQs” such that the acronym is followed by the explanation “(interrupt requests)” rather than only the word “request”.

Claim 15 is amended to add the missing word “node” after the word “second” in line 10 of the claim.

Applicant respectfully requests acceptance of these amendments. Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's representative if there are any questions or concerns regarding these technical corrections.

Objection to Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings under 37 CFR § 1.121 (d) because of handwritten labeling in Figures 3, 4, 5B, and 6-8.

It appears that the objection is directed to the original drawings filed in this application. Formal drawings to replace the original drawings were previously filed with the Patent Office on October 5, 2004, together with the Declaration in this matter. An examination of the PAIR system indicates that the formal drawings were received by the Patent Office on October 8, 2004. A copy of the previous submission is filed herewith.

It is submitted that the previously submitted formal drawings corrected the deficiencies in the original drawings, and that no handwritten labels are present in the formal drawings.

The Applicant requests that such drawings be accepted in this matter.

Objection to Specification – Summary

The Office Action has objected to the Specification for failure to include a summary of the invention. It is respectfully submitted that a summary is not legally required, and that the specification is correct in its present form.

Applicant respectfully submits that the presence of a "Summary of the Invention" in a patent application is not mandatory, and is not required by either 37 C.F.R. §1.73 or the MPEP. These merely indicate the location in the application in which the summary of the invention should be placed if the Applicant were to elect to include a summary.

In particular, 37 C.F.R. § 1.73 states that:

§ 1.73 Summary of the invention.

A brief summary of the invention indicating its nature and substance, which may include a statement of the object of the invention, should precede the detailed description. Such summary should, when set forth, be commensurate with the invention as claimed and any object recited should be that of the invention as claimed.

The regulation merely indicates that the summary “should precede the detailed description”, and that the summary should, “when set forth”, be commensurate with the invention as claimed and any object recited should be that of the invention as claimed. Thus, the first sentence indicates the proper placement of a summary, and the second sentence is limited to instances in which a summary is set forth, which thus indicates that the summary is optional. There is no requirement in the regulation that a summary “shall” or “must” be provided.

Similarly, MPEP §608.01 (d) describes the purpose of a summary, what should be contained within a summary, and what the summary may do. The MPEP contains no mandate for the inclusion of a summary in an application.

Accordingly, Applicant has elected not to include a “Summary of the Invention” in the present application, as is within the discretion of Applicant.

Allowable Subject Matter – Comments on Reasons for Allowance

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the Examiner’s thorough review of the above-captioned application and the finding of allowable subject matter in claims 1-5, 7-11, 14-18, and 21.

With regard to the finding of allowable subject matter, the Applicant submits herein a statement commenting on the reasons for allowance and respectfully requests that such statement be made of record.

The Examiner, in the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance, may have referenced paraphrased limitations from certain of the allowed claims. To clarify the record for anyone who may later view the file wrapper in this application, the Applicant would like to emphasize that each claim should not be construed to include the limitations listed by the Examiner in the reasons for allowance. Rather, each claim should be construed to include only those limitations explicitly recited in the language of the claim.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (503) 439-8778 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 5/30/2007

/Mark C. Van Ness/
Mark C. Van Ness
Reg. No. 39,865

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(503) 439-8778